

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 11, 2001 LB 620

to. I can't imagine why Senator Kristensen bothered to put what he calls, what he calls a "Rural Tier" in the bill if he was not concerned about those areas in the state that aren't doing very well economically. And they do happen to be rural. That's a fact. But if he wasn't concerned about them, and if he didn't want to bring up the rural/urban split, if there is such a thing, why does he have something he calls a "Rural Tier" in his bill? If he's attempting to do something that he thinks is for rural communities, why not give it a little kick? And that's the purpose of this amendment. Now, Senator Kristensen says that it is for the purpose of making sure that you get yours first. Well, it doesn't do that either. The fact of the matter is what we're talking about here is the renewal of the Quality Jobs Act, and guess what? There have already been seven applications approved under the Quality Jobs Act. This is a renewal of the Quality Jobs Act. At the worst, at the worst what Senator Kristensen could be describing is a sandwiching, just a sandwiching of a project in the "Rural Tier" between seven existing applications and any future applications that might come in during the five-year period that this extension or this renewal of the Quality Jobs Act would be in place. I am, quite frankly, a little befuddled by his opposition. Why should it be opposed? Why should it be opposed? Why should it be improper to create an incentive to actually implement one of the provisions that he put in the bill? Why would anyone oppose arguably making a provision in their own bill more effective? Why would anyone oppose adding a provision in a bill that might assure them that the provision they had in the bill would actually be used? I think, if anything, the reason for Senator Kristensen's opposition...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: ...would require additional discussion, even if you don't like the merits of the bill, of the proposal. Why, why, why, why, why oppose something that actually makes what you're attempting to do and what you've recognized yourself, why, why not enhance the chances that that would be effective?

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Wickeraham, you're recognized to